

REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated September 24, 2007. Claims 1-10 are presented for examination, of which Claims 1, 3 and 5 are in independent form. Claims 1, 3, 5 and 6 have been amended to define still more clearly what Applicant regards as his invention. Claims 7-10 have been amended as to matters of form; no change in scope is either intended or believed effected by at least these latter changes. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

Claims 5 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 on the grounds that the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Without conceding the correctness of the rejection, Applicant has carefully reviewed and amended the claims as suggested in the Office Action. It is believed that the rejection under Section 101 has been obviated and its withdrawal is, therefore, respectfully requested.

Claims 1-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,987,494 (Ouchi) and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0142683 A1 (Lam) and in further view of Thomson et al. (Request for comments 2462 IPv6 Stateless Autoconfiguration, The Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF)(online), December 1998.

As shown above, Applicant has amended independent Claims 1, 3 and 5 in terms that more clearly define what he regards as his invention. Applicant submits that these amended independent claims, together with the remaining claims dependent thereon, are patentably distinct from the cited prior art for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1 is directed to an image processing apparatus having a plurality of image processing functions. The apparatus includes: (1) IP address generating means, connected

to an IPv6 router on a network, for acquiring prefix information from the IPv6 router and generating an IP address unique to each of the plurality of image processing functions on the basis of the acquired prefix information; and (2) control means for communicating with other appliances on the network by use of the IP address generated for every image processing function and operating each of the plurality of image processing functions in accordance with a result of the communication via a common bus.

By virtue of the structure recited in Claim 1, since the control means can communicate with other appliances on the network by use of the IP address assigned to each of the functions of the image processing apparatus, it is not necessary to prepare an interface for each of the functions and, thus, an increase in cost can be avoided.

Ouchi relates to a multi-function parallel processing electronic device which performs a plurality of functions by using time sharing methods. However, Applicant has found nothing in Ouchi that would teach or suggest “IP address generating means, connected to an IPv6 router on a network, for acquiring prefix information from said IPv6 router and generating an IP address unique to each of the plurality of image processing functions on the basis of the acquired prefix information,” as recited in Claim 1. Based on the Office Action, it appears that the Examiner does not disagree.

Applicant also has found nothing in Ouchi that teaches or suggests “control means for communicating with other appliances on the network by use of the IP address generated for every image processing function and operating each of the plurality of image processing functions in accordance with a result of the communication via a common bus,” as recited in Claim 1. The Office Action cites paragraph [0036], lines 1-9 and column 3, lines 37-

47 as disclosing this feature. Applicant respectfully disagrees. First, there is no paragraph [0036] found in Ouchi. Second, column 3, lines 37-47 merely discusses, among other things, that the information processing device is provided with a facsimile function including a normal facsimile function and a data transmission function. However, Applicant has found nothing in that passage, or anywhere else in Ouchi that would teach or suggest the above-referenced control means recited in Claim 1.

Lam does not remedy the deficiencies of Ouchi. Lam relates to a router which communicates with a plurality of peripheral devices, each having a unique IP address, by using wireless devices or the Internet. However, the router is connected to each of the peripheral devices via a local interface. Accordingly, many interfaces are necessary, thus increasing costs. Further, while the Office Action cites paragraph [0036] as disclosing generating a IP address unique to each of the plurality of image processing functions, that passage merely discusses, among other things, that information stored in a memory provides a unique IP address for each of the peripheral devices. Applicants have found nothing in Lam that would teach or suggest “IP address generating means, connected to an IPv6 router on a network, for acquiring prefix information from said IPv6 router and generating an IP address unique to each of the plurality of image processing functions on the basis of the acquired prefix information” or “control means for communicating with other appliances on the network by use of the IP address generated for every image processing function and operating each of the plurality of image processing functions in accordance with a result of the communication via a common bus,” as recited in Claim 1.

Even if Thomson teaches all that it is cited for, it does not remedy the deficiencies of Ouchi and Lam.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that Claim 1 is patentable over Ouchi, Lam and Thomson, whether considered separately or in any permissible combination (if any).

A review of the other art of record has failed to reveal anything which, in Applicant's opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as a reference against Claim 1.

Independent Claims 3 and 5 are method and control program claims, respectively, corresponding to apparatus Claim 1, and are believed to be patentable over the cited prior art for at least the same reasons as discussed above in connection with Claim 1.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jennifer A. Reda/
Jennifer A. Reda
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No.: 57,840

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCHS_WS 1931857v1